

is presented, the Court is required to disqualify itself, whether or not it believes that it can be impartial.

In his motion, Plaintiff Robert B. Holt asserts that, for a time during 2010 and 2011, he provided information concerning his present lawsuit to an attorney of the firm of which the undersigned was a member. (ECF No. 176). Upon receipt of Plaintiffs' motion, the Court was able to confirm that Plaintiff Holt did, in fact, consult with one of the undersigned's former law partners about this matter and did provide documentation concerning this matter to said law partner, all during a time period in which the undersigned was still a member of the firm. The undersigned herself had no contact with Plaintiff Holt or any knowledge of the consultation. Nonetheless, the consultation and passing of documentation related to this matter appears to have taken place.

In light of the foregoing, the Court is constrained to conclude that it must recuse itself pursuant to the dictates of 28 U.S.C. § 455. In reaching this determination, the Court is likewise mindful of the appearance of impropriety standard set out in Canon 1 of the Code of Judicial Conduct. Plaintiffs' Motion for Recusal is therefore **GRANTED**. (ECF No. 176).



AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Mary G. Lewis
Honorable Mary Geiger Lewis
United States District Judge

Spartanburg, South Carolina
October 20, 2014